REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 883

VT 000 613

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR THE IDENTIFICATION, SELECTION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONS FOR LEADERSHIP ROLES IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

BY- WENRICH, RALPH C. HODGES, LEWIS H.
MICHIGAN UNIV., ANN ARBOR, SCH. OF EDUCATION

PUB DATE JUN 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.48 87P.

DESCRIPTORS- LEADERSHIP, PILOT PROJECTS, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *TECHNICAL EDUCATION, SUMMER WORKSHOPS, INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, QUESTIONNAIRES, LITERATURE REVIEWS, *LEADERSHIP TRAINING, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION, MICHIGAN,

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT WAS TO DEVELOP A PROGRAM FOR THE PREPARATION OF PERSONS TO BE EMPLOYED IN LEADERSHIP POSITIONS IN VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION. IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING PERSONS IN MICHIGAN WITH LEADERSHIP POTENTIAL AND A BACKGROUND IN VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION, AND THEN PREPARING THEM TO FUNCTION AS ADMINISTRATORS WERE THE MAJOR PROBLEMS OF THE PILOT PROGRAM. MALE CANDIDATES WERE SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF AGE, WORK EXPERIENCE, TEACHING EXPERIENCE, AND EDUCATION. SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS SUBMITTED 254 NAMES. OF THE 166 INTERESTED CANDIDATES, 99 MET ALL REQUIREMENTS AND WERE INTERVIEWED AND TESTED. FROM THIS GROUP, 40 CANDIDATES AND 7 ALTERNATES WERE NAMED. A COMBINATION OF MATCHING AND RANDOM METHODS WAS USED TO ESTABLISH GROUPS A AND B. GROUP A ATTENDED AN 8-WEEK SUMMER WORKSHOP AND A 1-YEAR INTERNSHIP WHILE GROUP B PARTICIPATED ONLY IN THE 1-YEAR INTERNSHIP. SOME CONCLUSIONS WERE -- (1) ADMINISTRATOR INVOLVEMENT WAS USEFUL DURING INTERNSHIP, (2) MUCH IS YET TO BE LEARNED ABOUT THE VALUE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS FOR SELECTION PURPOSES, AND (3) OTHER STATES ARE VITALLY INTERESTED IN SUCH PROGRAMS. IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT (1) THE PROGRAM BE CONTINUED, (2) AN EXTENSIVE FOLLOWUP OF PARTICIPANTS BE MADE, (3) THE LONGITUDINAL STUDY BE CONTINUED IN ORDER TO VALIDATE SELECTION CRITERIA, AND (4) FURTHER RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP BE ENCOURAGED. FURTHER DATA ON PARTICIPANTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE GIVEN IN THE APPENDIX. (EM)

06285-1-F

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ED013883

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Experimental Program for the Identification, Selection, and Development of Persons for Leadership Roles in the Administration and Supervision of Vocational and Technical Education

RALPH C. WENRICH
LEWIS H. HODGES

Sponsored by:

Michigan Department of Education
Division of Vocational Education
Lansing, Michigan
and
Carnegie Corporation of New York

TC00613

Administered through:

June 1966

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION · ANN ARBOR

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR THE IDENTIFICATION, SELECTION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONS FOR LEADERSHIP ROLES IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Project Director: Ralph C. Wenrich
Project Coordinator: Lewis H. Hodges
Research Assistants: Russell E. Hurd
Hercules C. Kazanas
George L. Richens
Earl W. Shaffer
Robert C. Wenzlaff

ORA Project 06285

sponsored by:

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
LANSING, MICHIGAN

and

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

administered through:

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION ANN ARBOR

June 1966

FOREWORD

The need for persons to assume leadership roles in vocational and technical eucation is not of recent origin, but this need has been emphasized by recent federal legislation relating to vocational education. Although the lack of qualified personnel to fill administrative positions in vocational and technical education also exists at state and national levels, this project was designed to deal with the preparation of persons for local leadership roles.

The establishment of a leadership development program in Michigan was under consideration for some time. The many requests for individuals to fill administrative and supervisory positions in community colleges, intermediate school districts, and local school districts made it imperative that action be taken. As a result, a research proposal was submitted to the sponsoring agencies and approved.

This is a report on the first University of Michigan Leadership Development Project for Vocational and Technical Education, that phase of the program supported by the State Board of Control for Vocational Education and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The program is being continued under a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Section 4(c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The services of Dr. M. Clemens Johnson were particularly helpful in the selection and use of appropriate statistical procedures. Drs. Howard S. Bretsch, Lester W. Anderson, and Dan H. Cooper gave valuable assistance in formulating the summer workshop program.

Ralph C. Wenrich
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 4

- A. The Idea of Leadership 5
- B. Functions of Leaders 7
- C. Personal Factors in Leadership 8
- D. Situational Aspects of Leadership: Leadership Acts 14
- E. Evaluation of Leadership 16
- F. Emergence of Leaders 17
- G. Leadership Approaches 17
- H. Identification and Selection of Persons with Leadership Potential for Vocational and Technical Education 18

III. PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT 20

- A. Organization 20
  - 1. Sponsorship 20
  - 2. Staffing 20
- B. Project Description 20
  - 1. Identification, Recruitment, and Selection 20
    - a. Establishing the criteria 20
    - b. Sources of candidates 21
    - c. Contacting administrators 22
    - d. Contacting the nominees 22
    - e. Initial screening procedure 23
    - f. Interview and testing 23
    - g. Final selection of the candidates 25
    - h. Group assignments 25
  - 2. Developmental Phase of the Program 26
    - a. The eight-week workshop 26
    - b. The internship program and monthly seminars 27
  - 3. Tentative Evaluation of the Project 29
    - a. Participant evaluation of the summer workshop 29
    - b. Evaluation of internship involvement 30
    - c. Participant evaluation of internships, field experiences, and monthly seminars 31
    - d. Effectiveness of developmental phase of the program 32

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Responses to Questionnaires from School Administrators 22
2. Nominees Identified by Teaching Fields 23
3. Public Opinion Questionnaire Scores for the Forty Participants 34
4. Percentile Analysis of Scores on the EPPS for the Forty Participants 35

I. INTRODUCTION

Two out of every three youths in the high schools and community colleges in the United States need some type of specialized education to help them make the transition from school to job. Through the Vocational Education Act of 1963, programs and services can be improved and new programs developed to help these youths. But the development of dynamic and functional programs depends to a large extent upon the availability of qualified educational leadership in local and intermediate school districts.

There is, in Michigan as elsewhere throughout the United States, a critical shortage of qualified persons to fill leadership positions in vocational and technical education. During the past few years, The University of Michigan has received a growing number of requests to nominate persons for leadership positions:

1. Local school districts are seeking persons to serve as directors of vocational education.
2. Intermediate school districts are interested in employing consultants of vocational and technical education.
3. Community college districts are searching for men to give leadership to the development and operation of occupationally oriented programs in community colleges.
4. The development of area vocational-technical programs will require competent leadership.
5. Perhaps the most significant development is in the comprehensive high school; many principals of such schools in Michigan are interested in having an assistant who would give leadership to the development of a total program for employment-bound youth (Wenrich and Ollenberger, 1963).

The purpose of this experimental program, therefore, was to develop a program for the preparation of persons to be employed in any of the above-mentioned positions. It was assumed that a person in any of these administrative positions would need to be well acquainted with many activities, and any composite job description for these positions would most certainly include the following areas: school curriculum, administration, and organization; vocational education programs and practices, past, present, and projected; legislation affecting vocational-technical education; survey, follow-up, job analysis, and community labor forecast techniques; personnel and public relation techniques; recognized factors affecting leadership, and personal skills necessary for effective leadership.

The problem was to identify and select persons in Michigan with a background in one of the vocational-technical fields with high leadership potential, and to prepare them as effectively as possible, within the framework of the project, to satisfy the requirements of a job specification encompassing such a diverse array of skills and areas of knowledge.

The President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education (United States Office of Education, 1963) had this to say about leadership:

> The leadership of vocational education will determine both its quality and effectiveness. In a rapidly changing world, this leadership must be dynamic and forward-looking, able to adapt its thinking to the constantly changing situation which it faces. Capable leadership is always in short supply especially in the new fields.
>
> Proposed expansion of vocational education programs intensifies the need for leadership development. Special attention should be given to the development of highly qualified professional personnel in the many facets of vocational education. The task is large and will require measures considerably beyond the facilities now provided. Professional staffs at universities that provide leadership training will have to be enlarged. Recruitment of candidates for leadership training will have to be expanded and incentives provided in the form of fellowships or other stipends to make it possible for acceptable candidates to undertake the training needed. In-service opportunities for leadership growth should be made available.

This pilot program was concerned with the problem of identifying and selecting persons in Michigan with a background in one of the vocational-technical fields and with high leadership potential, and then preparing them to function as administrators of occupational education. This program was designed to provide persons with a broad vocational education orientation not limited to any one of the traditional fields, so that these persons can give leadership to the development of an across-the-board vocational education program.

In the past, persons have moved into leadership positions in vocational-technical education with little or no special preparation. The common pattern of educational preparation of vocational personnel in our public schools is one of early specialization. Most teachers are recruited in the profession on the basis of their interest and technical competence in a particular trade or other occupation, and with a minimum of professional preparation and general education. Among teachers so recruited are many very able individuals who rise to leadership positions, frequently without the opportunity to acquire an understanding of the nature of our society and its needs. They need help in gaining an understanding of the total educational enterprise and the social and economic conditions of our society. They also need to develop the skills of an effective educational leader.

In view of this critical and expanding problem, The University of Michigan moved to establish a leadership development program. This program was officially launched in December of 1963 after a grant for the initial phase was secured from the Michigan State Board of Control for Vocational Education.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this brief survey is to orient the reader to the vast literature on leadership, and to present some of the research findings and theoretical positions pertinent to a combined training-research program such as The University of Michigan Leadership Development Program. Also, an attempt will be made to point out significant trends and current frontiers of research on leadership.

Petrullo (1961), in the introduction to the report on a symposium titled Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, states that leadership in a democratic society requires at least two basic assumptions: (1) that to survive, our society must be productive, and (2) that the individual cannot be sacrificed in the interest of group welfare. When applied, these basic assumptions often appear to be in conflict. Lasswell (1948) states, "Our concept of a democracy is that of a network of congenial and creative interpersonal relations (p. 110), and "Leadership is a complex pattern of congeniality and efficiency" (p. 185).

Anyone reviewing the literature on leadership is soon impressed by the amount of it. But the numerous approaches to leadership are also intriguing, and to some extent, diversionary. It is obvious that there is a tremendous concern with leadership in general and leadership as applied to particular situations; it is also a subject of much research. Perhaps psychologists have been most concerned, but many writers in other fields have found leadership a provocative subject; the literature is replete with leadership studies done in such fields as political science, sociology, history, anthropology, and economics. There are perhaps even more writers on the subject outside the social sciences than within. Military men, church leaders, politicians, journalists, financiers, industrialists, and even poets and dramatists have thought and written about leadership, because it is an ever-present aspect of interpersonal behavior. It is found everywhere—in totalitarian as well as democratic societies, among primitive as well as civilized people, among children, and even among animals.

The proliferation of literature in the field of leadership can be measured by the large number of books, articles, and research reports. Smith and Krueger (1933) did one of the early summaries of literature on leadership and listed 121 items in their bibliography. In 1948, Stogdill did a survey of the literature dealing only with personal factors associated with leadership and listed 124 items. Bass (1960) lists 1155 items, and Borgotta (1960) lists 1574 items on small group research. Perhaps the bibliography most directly related to leadership in educational administration is found in Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederikson (1962). The result of such proliferation is a marked tendency toward the absence of historical perspectives within a discipline (or research area) and a high degree of provinciality among the several disciplines. One exception to this, which should be of special interest to anyone concerned with leadership in education, is the Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, edited by Griffiths (1964), and titled Behavioral Science and Educational Administration.

Anyone planning to do leadership research or training would do well to consult the following sources for an historical and somewhat balanced perspective before entering either the broad field of leadership theory or a limited investigation into some special aspect of leadership: Smith (1933), Jenkins (1947), Stogdill (1948), Gibb (1954), Petrullo (1961), Griffiths (1964), and McCleary and Hencley (1965, Chapter 5).

A. The Idea of Leadership

Leadership has been defined in general terms. Webster's New International Dictionary (1957) defines a leader as

> A person or animal that goes before to guide or show the way, or one who precedes or directs in some action, opinion, or movement; Esp.: a. A guide; conductor. b. One having authority to proceed and direct; a chief, a commander, a captain. c. One who proceeds and is followed by others in conduct, opinion, undertaking, etc.; the chief as of a party or sect. d. The front or foremost person in a file or advancing body.

Ordway Tead, the author of The Art of Leadership (1935) states in the Encyclopedia Britannica (1957) that leadership is "...the exercising of influence over others on behalf of the leader's purposes, aims, or goals... Leadership in its deeper meaning has the more difficult task of being concerned with what the follower should want, may come to want, or be brought to want in terms of his own aims as projected against the common good."

Cartwright and Zander (1953) point out the difficulties of defining leadership:

> To some, leadership is a property of a group, while to others it is a characteristic of an individual. To those who emphasize the group, leadership may be synonymous with prestige, with the holding of an office, or with the performance of activities important to the group. To those who stress the individual, however, leadership may mean the possession of certain personality characteristics such as dominance, ego-control, aggressiveness, or freedom from paranoid tendencies, or it may mean the possession of certain physical

characteristics such as tallness or an impressive physiognomy.

Much effort has been expended, particularly in the early literature, in defining leadership by classifying leaders into types or styles. Bass (1960) lists the following:

Intellectual vs. Authoritative
Compellers vs. Exponents vs. Representatives
Cognitive vs. Authoritative
Formulators vs. Foci of Attention
Physical vs. Intellectual
Static vs. Dynamic
Impressors vs. Oppressors
Adhesive-Dynamic vs. Dynamic-Infusive
Volunteer vs. Drafted
General vs. Specialized
Temporary vs. Permanent
Conscious vs. Unconscious
Professional vs. Amateur
Personal vs. Impersonal
Direct vs. Indirect
Social vs. Mental
Autocratic vs. Paternalistic vs. Democratic
Intellectual vs. Business
Small Groups vs. Mass Leader vs. Administrator

Many other examples of polar categories will be found in the literature. The most persistent has been the authoritarian-democratic classification popularized by White and Lippitt's early group experiments with children at the University of Iowa. (See, for example, White and Lippitt, 1953, and White and Lippitt, 1960)

Darley, however, has cautioned (Petrullo and Bass, 1961, p. 361) that:

> The dichotomy democratic-authoritarian used to define leadership behavior or group behavior should be avoided by psychologists. These terms have a legitimate and meaningful usage in the field of political science. But when they are taken out of this context and applied to laboratory research they may be misleading and may have a pejorative connotation that biases the interpretation of research findings.

Gibb (Lindzey, Vol. 2, 1954, pp. 880-884) reviews and discusses definitions of "leader" under the following categories:

The leader as an individual in a given office,

The leader as focus for the behavior of group members,
The leader in terms of sociometric choice,
Differentiation between leadership and headship,
The leader defined in terms of influence upon syntality.

In his summary (p. 916), Gibb further discusses the problem of definition:

> Whenever two or more persons interact in the pursuit of a common goal, the relation of leadership and followership soon becomes evident. This relation is characterized by influence or control of one group member over others. Identification of the leader is by no means simple, however.

He then discusses the categories listed above, and concludes:

> Because of the difficulties involved in using any of these forms of definition, it has recently been proposed that attention be given not to designated leaders but to leader behavior occurring in a group. Leadership acts may then be defined as the investigator wishes, and leaders are to be defined by the relative frequency with which they engage in such acts.

Since our study is concerned with the "leader" as an individual in a set of given offices, we are concerned primarily with meaning of leadership mentioned above. But we must be careful not to make a one-to-one relationship between leadership and administration; this matter will be discussed later.

As to the qualities of a leader, Tead (1957), in a previously mentioned source, states:

> Other things being equal, people who lead in any important way are observed to have a generous endowment of physical and nervous energy; they have a compelling urge toward some specific purpose or goal; they have some mastery of the technical ways and means of achieving the aim they profess; they are able to sustain the confidence, loyalty, and often the affection of those who become followers; they are more than normally persuasive in helping others to enlist in and support the cause to be served.

B. Functions of Leaders

Krech and Crutchfield (1962) list fourteen functions which a leader may perform. They indicate that a leader is:

> ...someone who serves to some degree as an executive, planner, policy maker, expert, external group representative, controller of internal relationships, purveyor of rewards and punishments, arbitrator, exemplar, group symbol, surrogate for individual responsibility, ideologist, father figure, or scapegoat.

Redl (1942) taking the psychoanalytic approach, has quite a different list of functions. These functions are conceived as operating through such mechanisms as identification, cathexis, guilt reduction, impulse control, and incorporation of superego.

According to Cartwright and Zander (1953, p. 539), it is not possible, at the present stage of research on groups, to develop a fully satisfactory designation of these group functions which are peculiarly functions of leadership. They also state that:

> Much more research is needed to determine more precisely what sorts of goals bring about what kinds of leadership behavior and how they exert this influence.
>
> Just as the nature of the group task influences the kinds of leadership behavior that arise in a group, so should we expect the specific needs for group maintenance to influence leadership behavior. If, on the other hand, the group's problem is that it has such low prestige in the community that members are leaving, quite different leader activities would be expected. It is unfortunate that most of the carefully controlled studies of leader behavior have been conducted with temporarily organized groups where, almost of necessity, members are not concerned with the preservation of the group.
>
> Although we know little of a systematic kind about the processes involved, it is apparent that the nature of the leadership behavior chosen for the performance of group functions will be influenced by situational factors both inside and outside the group.

C. Personal Factors in Leadership

Considerable research has been concerned with characteristics of leaders. Studies including comparisons between leaders and followers relative to physical, personality, or intellectual traits have been frequently attempted. Hollingworth (1926) reports:

> ...that leaders tend to be bigger (but not too much bigger) and brighter (but not too much brighter) than the rest of the members.

Cartwright and Zander (1953) state:

> On the whole, the attempt to discover the traits that distinguish leaders from non-leaders has been disappointing. Bird, in his book Social Psychology (1940), made an extensive examination of the research relevant to this problem and was able to compile a long list of traits which in one or more studies appeared to differentiate leaders from non-leaders. The discouraging fact, however, was that only about 5% of the "discovered" traits were common to four or more investigations.

Stogdill (1948) has produced only slightly more encouraging conclusions. He reports that various studies of leadership traits continue to result in contradictory findings.

About the only thing of a tangible nature is that it appears that leaders excel non-leaders in intelligence, scholarship, dependability and responsibility, activity and social participation, and socio-economic status. In some more current studies in certain specialized situations, a few traits have emerged which seem to have some worth. In 1961 Darley pointed out (Petrullo, 1961, p. 362) that:

> ...it has become fashionable to define leadership as related to situations and as relatively uninfluenced by individual traits. We cannot, I think, brush under the rug the problem of leadership traits as easily as we have seemed to do in recent years.
>
> ...
>
> More attention in our studies of group behavior and leadership should be given to the interaction of individual traits and situational factors.

Gibb (Lindzey, Vol. 2, 1954, pp. 913-914), after reviewing the "trait" theory of leadership, describes a theory which he named the interaction theory. He said:

> Any comprehensive theory of leadership must incorporate and integrate all the major variables which are now known to be involved, namely, (1) the personality of the leader, (2) the followers with their attitudes, needs, and problems, (3) the group itself both as regards (a) structure of interper-

> sonal relations and (b) syntality characteristics, (4) the situations as determined by physical setting, nature of task, etc. Furthermore, any satisfactory theory must recognize that it will not be these variables per se which enter into the leadership relation, but that it is the perception of the leader by himself and by others, the leader's perception of those others, and the shared perception by leaders and others of the group and the situation with which we have to deal. No doubt Sanford (1952) is right when he predicts that studies focusing on any one of these aspects alone will continue to yield "positive but unexciting correlations."

It is interesting that at the time Darley made his statement two extensive research projects were under way, Gross and Herriott (1965), and Hemphill (1962), one almost completed and one just starting, which would deal extensively with the interaction of personality factors and a specific situational context (the elementary school principalship). Gross and Herriott indicate in the following statement what appears to be the present stance of researchers with respect to personality factors in leadership:

> Although we, like most present-day students of leadership, reject a unitary trait theory of leadership, we do not reject the possibility that, in certain situational contexts, specific traits of individuals may be associated with their leadership. As Stogdill and Gibb have pointed out, the literature on correlates of leadership provides little support for the hypothesis that one or more traits are common to all kinds of leaders. However, this does not imply that among individuals who serve as the formal leaders of the same type of organizations, traits may not be uncovered that are associated with variation in their leadership.

The authors state further that the aim of their study is to:

> ...present and test a series of hypotheses to account for differential performance of principals in the hope not only of shedding light on pressing practical questions in educational administration but also of contributing to a relatively neglected problem in social science: organizational leadership in professional settings.

They present a significant contribution to the theory of leadership in their conceptualization of the particular situational type of leadership which they term "Executive Professional Leadership" and define as follows:

> In this study, the phenomenon of central interest is the effort of an executive of a professionally staffed

> organization to conform to a definition of his role that stresses his obligation to improve the quality of staff performance. We designate such behavior as Executive Professional Leadership (EPL). (Emphases supplied)

The authors then point out the newness of the area being explored:

> Although the laboratory for our inquiry was the public schools, the questions we have examined about the determinants and effects of Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) deal with issues of central importance to the operation of any kind of professionally staffed organization. In conducting this research, we have been impressed by how limited is our knowledge of the structure and functioning of enterprises of this type and especially of the problems confronting their executives. Since professionally staffed organizations will undoubtedly increase in number and importance in the decades ahead, research studies that contribute to our understanding of the determinants and effects of Executive Professional Leadership will have important practical as well as scientific implications.

They then prescribe certain contextual specifications for their EPL concept, as follows:

> The behavior of informal leaders in organizations is an important area of study, but it is not the subject of our inquiry. The problems we shall examine focus on the performance of formal leaders of organizations, individuals who have been assigned to serve as their executives.
>
> A second specification of the study is that the formal leaders whom we shall study are executives of professionally staffed organizations. The fact that organizations vary in the degree of skill, expertise, and autonomy of their employees who must be "managed" is not a novel idea in the organizational literature, but its theoretical and practical implications as to leadership have been largely ignored. We define a professionally staffed organization as one whose core activities are carried on by personnel who have completed specialized training at institutions of higher learning, and who have been judged to possess at least the minimum competence required to perform their organizational tasks in an essentially autonomous manner.

Gross and Herriott report statistical significance for the following propositions with respect to selected personal attributes of the elementary school principal:

1. The higher a principal's evaluation of his ability to provide educational leadership to his staff, the greater his EPL.

2. The more off-duty time a principal devotes to his job, the greater his EPL.

3. Principals with a service motive for seeking their positions will provide greater EPL than those without it.

4. The greater the intellectual ability of the principal, the greater his EPL.

5. The greater the executive's interpersonal skills, the greater his EPL.

In another part of their report, Gross and Herriott discuss previous administrative and teaching experience, and experience in the principalship as possible factors in EPL abilities. Their findings are:

1. It appears that previous administrative experience in public education has no apparent relationship to professional leadership...

2. No clear-cut bearing on EPL score is revealed by length of elementary or secondary teaching experience, of all types of teaching experience, or the length of time it took to achieve the first principalship after the first job in public education.

3. As to the principal's age at the time of his first principalship, with the exception of one age category, the trend is that the younger a principal was at the time of his first appointment to the principalship, the stronger his professional leadership later on...

Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederikson (1962) in their research project, "Administrative Performance and Personality," wanted to compare the administrative performance of different elementary school principals and, at the same time, avert the fundamental criticism applied to earlier studies, that of confusing differences attributable to the unique properties of a specific school situation with those differences due to the unique personality of the principal. In order to do this, they simulated a school (Whitman School) wherein it was possible to systematically observe the administrative styles of 232 elementary school principals encountering the same administrative problems in the same setting. The three stated objectives of the study were:

1. To determine dimensions of performance in the elementary school principalship, and thus develop a better understanding of the nature of the job of the school administrator.

2. To provide information helpful in the solution of the problems of selecting school administrators.

3. To provide materials and instruments for the study and teaching of school administrators.

The 232 principals participating in this study at Whitman School provided an extensive body of data concerning themselves and their administrative performance. The discovery of ten factors relating to how the principals handled their "in-basket performances" provided the authors with a basic framework for viewing administrative work and enabled them to draw some salient implications for the actual practice of administration. The ten factors are:

Major Factors

1. Factor X: Preparation for decision vs. taking final action
2. Factor Y: Amount of work done in handling items

Additional Factors

3. Factor A: Exchanging information
4. Factor B: Discussing before acting
5. Factor C: Complying with suggestions made by others
6. Factor D: Analyzing the situation
7. Factor E: Maintaining organizational relationships
8. Factor F: Organizing work
9. Factor G: Responding to outsiders
10. Factor H: Directing the work of others

While Factor H, directing the work of others, is more closely related to the common notion of "leadership" than any one of the other factors, and while some form of leadership may be implied in such factors as exchanging information, discussing before acting, or maintaining organizational relationships, the fact is that a clear "leadership" factor did not emerge from the study. "This would seem to indicate that administrative performance is much more than leadership, and that when leadership is stressed to the exclusion of other aspects of administration, an incomplete picture is presented" (p. 345).

The results of this study also indicate that school districts might well consider introducing a system of formal evaluation of principals by superiors and subordinates. These judgments would reflect the conflicting expectations of leader behavior, with the superiors stressing the nomothetic dimension of administration ("by the book"), and teachers stressing the idiographic dimension (in terms of the people in the situation); but these judgments would nevertheless be valuable to the superintendent if viewed as complementary.

> A conclusion reached in this study about the problem of selection is similar to that of other studies of the selection of administrators. No one test can be recommended that will unerringly choose a "successful" principal. Selection remains what it has always been, a highly complex act (p. 339).
>
> The major implication of this study is that simulation offers an excellent method of teaching skills to administrators. While the use of simulation as an instructional device was not studied, the reaction of the subjects to the technique was enthusiastic, and the principals in the study suggested it be used for instruction (p. 351).

It seems fairly obvious that both the personality characteristics and performance variables involved in a complex job situation such as educational administration are bound to be numerous, and that their interaction with one another will tend to obscure their basic relationships.

D. Situational Aspects of Leadership: Leadership Acts

Following Stogdill's exhaustive treatment of personality factors in leadership, the Ohio State University Personnel Research Board turned its attention to situational factors in leadership. Hemphill's monograph (1949) analyzes the interaction of factors in leadership (group dimensions, leadership adequacy, and behavior of leaders) and, from this, developed a "Questionnaire" for "A Study of Group Behavior." (See Hemphill, Appendix B)

Based on Hemphill's work, the Ohio State group developed a Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as "an attempt to develop an objective method for describing _how_ a leader carries on his activities" (Stogdill, 1957, pp. vii, 6-7). _Leadership Behavior: Its Description and Measurement_ (Stogdill, 1957) describes the evolution and application of the various forms of this influential and widely used questionnaire. (The LBDQ is still actively used in leadership research. For example, see Luckie, 1963) The apogee of this trend in leadership research was probably Stogdill's _Individual Behavior and Group Achievements: A Theory, the Experimental Evidence_ (1959).

In 1961, Darley remarked (Petrullo, 1961, p. 360):

> I think we have completely demonstrated and overdetermined two variables that first arose in the Ohio State research on leadership: consideration and initiation of structure (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). Like the authoritarian scale, however, they were found to be somewhat multiform as we trace, through Research Monograph No. 88, the items which appear in the scales under various conditions and at various times. But again, like the authoritarian scales, these variables seem adequately defined and they seem essentially to be the same variables that Dr. Flanagan talks about under the terms *Planning and Motivating*. They may also be the same variables that Dr. Berrien describes under the terms *formal achievement* and *group need satisfaction*; they are the same that Dr. Likert has in mind when he discusses *feelings of personal worth* and *ways of attaining these feelings*. In all these studies, research converges to give the reader greater assurance that these are true and relevant variables in understanding the behavior of individuals in either groups or organizations.

Cartwright and Zander (1953), not unlike Barnard's concept of organizational efficiency and effectiveness, have pointed out that most group objectives may be encompassed in two types of activities: (1) activities directed toward the attainment of stated group goals and (2) activities directed toward maintaining or strengthening the work group. Examples cited by Cartwright and Zander as being indicative of member behavior aimed at goal achievement are: "initiates action," "keeps members' attention on the goal," "clarifies the issue," "develops a procedural plan," "evaluates the quality of work done," and "makes expert information available." On the other hand, member behaviors directed toward the group-maintenance function would include: "keeps interpersonal relations pleasant," "arbitrates disputes," "provides encouragement," "gives the minority a chance to be heard," "stimulates self-direction," and "increases the interdependence among members."

Although Gross and Herriott (1965) do not limit themselves to the behavioral approach, they do find positive statistical significance for the following propositions regarding relationships between executives and their immediate subordinates:

1. The more a principal permits his teachers to share in his decisions, the greater his EPL (pp. 121-124).

2. The more egalitarian a principal's relationship with his teachers, the greater his EPL (pp. 125-126).

3. The more social support a principal offers to his teachers, the greater his EPL (pp. 126-128).

4. The greater the managerial support a principal offers his teachers, the greater his EPL (pp. 128-129).

5. The greater the principal's support of his teachers in cases of conflict between teacher and pupil, the greater his EPL.

Gross and Herriott's propositions provide interesting parallels to "consideration" items on the Ohio State Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (Stogdill, 1957, p. 42, Table 4).

E. Evaluation of Leadership

Krech and Crutchfield (1962) discuss the problem of determining who is a "good" or a "poor" leader. For one thing, it depends upon whose perspective is taken. There is often a difference in the evaluation of a leader "from above" and "from below." Because of this discrepancy, the leader is often placed in a serious conflict of roles, especially in our democratic culture which tends to value "getting things done," but at the same time is suspicious of leadership and dominance.

Lipman (1960) did a study of the personal variables and their relationship to the judged effectiveness of principals. He found that principals judged to be ineffective by superiors were deliberate in nature, satisfied with present status and achievement, preferred assisting children to working with teachers, depended on others for support, often showed strong emotion in charged situations, and showed preoccupation with speculative reasoning. Principals judged to be effective engaged in a strong, purposeful activity, related well to people, sought success and higher-status positions, and felt secure in both home and work settings.

Another study by Boyce (1960) revealed that both the aesthetic and religious scales of the *Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values* and the abasement and nurture factors of the *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule* showed significant positive correlations with superiors' effectiveness ratings of subordinates.

Luckie (1963) did a study of "Leader Behavior of Directors of Instruction." He concluded that:

> The director of instruction appears to lead best when he is showing a great deal of consideration to his fellow staff members. Skill in human relations or in maintaining group morale appear to be of vital concern to the director's satisfactory leader performance.

> It was concluded that the director of instruction finds himself in a role where no conflicting expectations between superintendents and staff members exists.
>
> It was concluded that human relations be a part of the training for prospective directors of instruction.

Luckie used the Ohio State University Personnel Research Board "Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," in his study.

F. Emergence of Leaders

Many times leaders are designated as such by title and position. However, in many other group situations, particularly if the groups continue for a considerable length of time, usually some person within the group will emerge in a leadership role.

The characteristics of the members within the group influence leader selection. Sanford (Krech and Crutchfield, 1958) has found, for example, that group members having an "authoritarian" outlook prefer and demand strong directive leadership; conversely, members having an "equalitarian" outlook are more likely to prize traits of good "human relations" in the leader rather than directive leadership.

G. Leadership Approaches

Researchers have found that the most effective leaders in our society seem to be those classified as "democratic leaders."

> A democratic leader (is one who) accepts responsibility for playing a major role in assisting a group or an organization to reach its goals and meets this responsibility in such a way as to recognize and to utilize the contributions that individuals inside and outside the group or organization can make toward reaching these goals and in such a way as to secure the maximum cooperation of these individuals in making their contributions (Corbally _et_ _al_., 1961).

Various approaches have been advanced as to the qualities of "good" leadership and "good" leaders. Five such approaches, or theories, are commonly used in social and psychological research studies. These are as follows: "The Trait Approach," which is based on the hypothesis that there are certain physical, intellectual, or personality traits that the leader must possess which make for "good" leadership; "The Situation Approach" which is based on the claim that a leader's behavior may vary from one setting to another (thus, different situations require different leadership behavior); "The Behavioral Approach," which is based on the hypothesis that the kind of leadership position an individual holds determines the degree to which he carries out certain functions; "The Styles-of-Leadership Approach," which is based on the claim that different group climates necessitate or create different styles of leadership behavior; and "The Functional Leadership Approach," which is based on the hypothesis that certain actions are required by the group under various conditions if it is to accomplish its objectives (therefore, leadership is the performance of these acts which are required by the group).

Without a doubt, in almost any situation, the leader needs certain traits; he is motivated by personal drives and external forces; he performs certain functions indigenous to his position; he acts in a particular way according to the character of the group; and, finally, he shares certain leadership tasks with the members of the group. Thus, he applies all the aforementioned approaches to some extent.

H. Identification and Selection of Persons with Leadership Potential for Vocational and Technical Education

How do we identify and select educational leaders under these assumptions? Although the research on the problem of identification is relatively limited, it points out that educators with administrative and leadership potential are not readily identifiable. Information on how to recruit and further develop this talent when it is identified is also scarce. One study points out, however, that

> ...the personal qualities of educational leaders, their attitudes, their purposes, and their relationships with other people...were more closely correlated to success on the job than were technical information, technical skills, and even intelligence as measured by traditional intelligence tests (Meece and Eckel, 1961).

In regard to criteria for selection of persons for leadership roles, it has been pointed out already that while much research has been done in an effort to determine the nature of educational leadership and the qualities and competencies of successful leaders in educational positions, most investigations have dealt with the positions and roles of superintendents of schools, school supervisors, and school principals. No study was found dealing directly with leadership in administrative and supervisory positions in the field of vocational and technical education. However, the studies which have been done in relation to criteria for selection of educational leaders in other fields have been helpful.

In the research on leadership in other areas (educational and non-educational), the trend has continued unabated toward viewing leadership, not as a static concept of leadership traits, but as a complex and dynamic involvement of leader, followers and situation. This trend reinforces a basic postulate of The University of Michigan Leadership Development Program that leadership training, in order to be effective, must be as broad and interdisciplinary as the circumstances of the program permit.

III. PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A. Organization

1. SPONSORSHIP

This project received the assistance of personnel in both the Department of Vocational Education and Practical Arts, and the Department of Administration and Supervision of the School of Education at The University of Michigan. Funds for operation of the project were provided by the Michigan Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education. The Carnegie Corporation of New York provided funds for scholarships for the twenty members of the 1964 summer workshop. The original allocation of funds was for a program to operate one year. Since not all funds allocated were expended during the first year, authorization was given by the Department of Education to use the unexpended balance to continue the project into the second year.

2. STAFFING

The project personnel consisted of the project director, the project coordinator, and a total of five research assistants involved at various points in the project.

The services of forty-eight guest lecturers were used during the summer workship; eight visiting lecturers were used in the seminars operated during the internship period.

B. Project Description

1. IDENTIFICATION, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTION

a. Establishing the Criteria

Criteria of age, work experience, teaching experience, and education were used in identifying prospective candidates. A minimum of two years' teaching experience and two years' work experience in a field other than education were decided upon as a reasonable requirement for persons training for administrative positions in vocational-technical education. Minimum educational requirements were a B.S. degree and a teaching certificate. Only male applicants were considered for the first project.

It was assumed that, in most cases, men who are capable of attaining a position of educational leadership will have done so by the age of forty-five. Since this project was designed to identify and assist in the preparation of potential leaders, it was decided that persons older than forty-five years of age would be excluded. However, in applying this criterion, it was discovered that three applicants, otherwise highly qualified, were slightly over the forty-five year age limit. After further consideration by the screening committee, they were included in the project.

b. Sources of Candidates

After the initial criteria for identification were decided upon, possible methods of collecting names of qualified candidates were considered. Of the several sources considered, two were chosen as practical within the limits of time and funds available for the project.

First, through the Michigan Department of Public Instruction IBM filing system, an attempt was made to identify all teachers with majors in agriculture, business, or industrial education, who met the other initial criteria. This source proved inadequate, because the filing system was incomplete, and its classification code did not lend itself to the established criteria.

Therefore, the second method, in which school administrators were asked to submit the names of persons whom they considered to be potential leaders in vocational-technical education, was used. This method of selection contained some inherent disadvantages. Some administrators had a larger number of potential candidates from which to choose than others. It was no doubt difficult for administrators to avoid some personal bias in making their recommendations.

However, the involvement of local administrators was viewed as a potential strength for the total project, since the second major phase of the project, the internship experience, was dependent for its success upon the support and cooperation of the interns' local administrators. By asking the administrator to nominate certain persons from his school system, he was made to feel a part of and important to the success of the project, as he most certainly was. This attitude was reflected in the many letters received from administrators. The close communication and cooperation thus created between the project officials and the local administrators played an essential role in the total acceptance of the project.

c. Contacting Administrators

A questionnaire and accompanying cover letter were prepared and sent to 1109 administrators (574 principals, 454 superintendents, 33 local directors of vocational education, 31 teacher educators, and 17 community college deans) requesting names of persons whose qualifications seemed appropriate to the project. Since most small school systems have only limited vocational offerings, the questionnaire was sent only to those school systems with an enrollment of at least 600 pupils. (See Appendix A, pp. 49-52)

Of those who responded to the questionnaire, most nominated one or more persons. As many as four persons were nominated by one administrator. A total of 171, or nearly 30 percent, of the principals responded, nominating 104 persons. A total of 162, or more than 35 percent, of the school superintendents responded, nominating 109 persons. A total of 22, or 67 percent, of the vocational directors responded, nominating 16 persons. A total of 12, or more than 70 percent, of the community college deans responded, nominating 10 persons, and a total of 12, or 67 percent, of the teacher educators responded, nominating 15 persons. (See Table 1)

TABLE 1

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FROM SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Local School Administrators	Number of Questionnaires Sent	Number of Questionnaires Received	Percent Responded	Nominations Made
High School Principals	574	171	29+	104
School Superintendents	454	162	35+	109
Local Vocational Directors	33	22	67	16
Community College Deans	17	12	70+	10
Selected Teacher Educators	31	21	67+	15
Totals	1109	388		254

d. Contacting the Nominees

After all replies were received from administrators, a questionnaire and cover letter were prepared and mailed to the 254 nominees to inform them of the project and of the fact that they had been nominated as candidates. Those wishing to participate in the project, were asked to complete and return the questionnaire by a specified date. The questionnaire requested information such as age, teaching experience, work experience, education, military experience, participation in social and professional organizations, honors and awards received, leadership positions held, and names and addresses of present immediate supervisors. This information was to be used by the project staff for selection purposes. (See Appendix B, pp. 53-58)

Of the 254 nominees contacted, 168 responded, including two who stated that they would be unable to participate in the project. The remaining 166 formed the group from which the 40 candidates were to be selected.

e. Initial Screening Procedure

The initial screening of qualifications was done cooperatively by the Project Director, the Project Coordinator, and two research assistants. Together, they studied the personal data of all participants, and eliminated those who did not meet one or more of the initial identification criteria. Of the 166 nominees, 67 did not meet one or more of the following criteria: unable to attend the interviewing and testing period (2); age (15); not in one of the required teaching fields (6); and inadequate work experience (34). Of the remaining 99 nominees, 11 were teachers of agricultural subjects; 22 were teachers of business subjects; 63 were teachers of industrial subjects; and 3 were teachers of technical subjects at the community college level. (See Table 2)

TABLE 2

NOMINEES IDENTIFIED BY TEACHING FIELDS

(After Initial Screening)

Teaching Field	Number of Nominees	Percent
Agricultural Education	11	11.11
Business Education	22	22.22
Industrial Education	63	63.63
Technical Education	3	3.04
Totals	99	100.00

f. Interview and Testing

The remaining 99 nominees were invited to come to Ann Arbor for interviews and testing. They were scheduled in small groups over a six-day period. They were invited to spend the day on campus for testing during the morning, lunch and group observation at noon, and interviewing in the afternoon. The testing session lasted approximately three hours, and each nominee was given two half-hour interviews by two different staff members.

Using a specially prepared interview form (see Appendix C, pp. 59-60), the four members of the project staff, assisted by other School of Education faculty members, evaluated each nominee's general appearance, communicative skills, quality of work experience, quality of teaching experience, goals and aspirations, enthusiasm, level of maturity, etc. Upon completion of the interviews, each interviewer made his general assessment of the nominee by ranking him according to the following categories: very high recommendation, high recommendation, recommendation, recommendation with reservations, or no recommendation. This assessment was noted on the interview form. The reports of the two interviewers for each nominee were compared for consistency.

If the two assessments differed sharply, the case was reconsidered individually by the total screening committee. Five tests were administered to the 99 nominees. Three were standardized tests: The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, and the Public Opinion Questionnaire, a revised edition of the California-F Scale. Candidates were also asked to respond to an inventory of personality traits (adapted from the Edwards Preference Schedule), and to make a list of personal characteristics perceived as important for the positions for which they wished to prepare. (See Appendix D, pp. 61-64) These test results were to be used primarily for purposes of research, although they were included in the data reviewed during the final selection of nominees. The EPPS and the POQ were also administered following the completion of the internship phase of the project; the two sets of test results were to be used to determine whether or not the workshop made any significant difference in the test scores.

The choice of tests used reflects an attempt to find out as much as possible about each candidate with existing instruments, and within the time available. Although there was no known precedent for the use of any of these instruments for leadership development projects specifically geared to the needs of vocational-technical education administration, each of the standardized tests had been used with some success in the selection of candidates for other types of educational administration programs.

The Edwards, the Psychological Examination, and the Public Opinion Questionnaire seemed to represent the most reliable instruments available to describe the participants in terms of their self-image, their attitude toward society and their fellow-man, and their individual personal adjustment.

An underlying assumption was that the results of these tests might: (1) point out specific strengths and weaknesses which could be helpful in any counseling to be done with project participants, (2) reveal any outstanding deviations from accepted norms, which might be useful in predicting the success of the candidate in such a leadership project, and (3) support the hypothesis that participants in the summer workshop would be better prepared to assume positions of leadership in vocational-technical education than those who participated in only the internship phase.

During the testing and interview phase of the project, a reference questionnaire was sent to the immediate supervisor of each of the 99 nominees. The purpose of this questionnaire was to seek the reactions of the supervisors to a number of questions dealing with the basic leadership qualities and character traits of the nominees. (See Appendix E, pp. 65-67) In some cases as many as four persons were contacted for additional information, by mail, by phone, or in person. These data were kept in individual, confidential files, accessible only to the project staff members.

After all necessary data were collected into the individual files, a number, rather than the name of the nominee, was assigned to each file. This was done because it was easier to record and otherwise handle numbers than names, and because, not knowing the name corresponding to the data in the file, the evaluator could be more objective.

g. Final Selection of the Candidates

The Project Director, Project Coordinator, and the two research assistants carefully reviewed all information available on all nominees and ranked each on a three-point scale as qualified, doubtful, or not qualified. The results of the staff members' evaluation were then tabulated. On the basis of these ratings, 40 men were selected to participate. In addition, 7 alternates were selected and listed in the order in which they would be contacted if members of the group of 40 declined the invitation to participate.

It was fortunate that 7 alternates were provided. Upon learning that a member of their faculty had been selected for the project, some local school administrators reconsidered that person for existing positions of increased responsibility. As a result, 4 of the selected participants were placed in administrative positions for the following school year and decided that they needed the time, which would otherwise have been dedicated to the workshop, to familiarize themselves with the duties of the new positions.

h. Group Assignments

Each candidate was assigned to one of two groups. Those in group A would participate in an eight-week workshop plus a one-year internship. Those assigned to group B would participate only in the one-year internship phase of the project. The grouping was designed to support the hypothesis that those members who participated in both the workshop and the internship would be discernibly better prepared to assume positions of leadership in vocational-technical education than would those who took part only in the internship.

For the formation of the two groups, the assigned numbers corresponding to individual participants within each of the three teaching fields (agricultural, business, and industrial education) were matched according to teaching experience and education, by plotting these two factors on two coordinates. Then the two numbers which were found nearest together on the two coordinates were taken to form the pair. The pairs were arranged in a column, randomly, with the smaller number of the pair first and the larger number second. A coin was tossed once for each pair, with the understanding that the head correspond to the larger number and the tail to the smaller. If the coin turned up heads, the larger number was assigned to group A; if tails came up, the smaller number became a member of group A. The four staff members tossed the coin alternately.

This method of selection was considered statistically sound, in that it was a combination of the matching and random methods commonly used in statistical sampling, and in that it resulted in two groups whose members were presumed to be matched.

2. DEVELOPMENTAL PHASE OF THE PROGRAM

a. The Eight-Week Summer Workshop

To provide the specific knowledge necessary for an effective vocational-technical education administrator, and to acquaint the participants with accepted leadership practice techniques, an eight-week summer workshop was held at The University of Michigan for group A during the summer of 1964.

In order to encourage the development of greater understanding of the social forces which affect educational leadership in modern society, and to provide for the study and practice of the personal skills used by leaders, an interdisciplinary approach was used, utilizing the resources of 48 special consultants from the fields of government, the social sciences, business, industry, agriculture, and education, who were guest lecturers during the summer workshop.

Topics covered by lecturers were organized into eight general categories. The categories and the number of hours of lecture-discussion time dedicated to each were as follows:

Administrative Functions..............	26
Personal Skills......................	19
Organizational Problems...............	15
Leadership Factors...................	12
Supervision-Curriculum Development.....	11
Socio-Economic Considerations..........	6
Industrial Psychology.................	4

Human relations theory and practice were stressed throughout the workshop and internship phases of the project.

In addition, the fields of agriculture, home economics, business, trades and industry, technical education, industrial arts, and adult education were studied from an administrative viewpoint. Because each workshop participant was experienced in teaching, coordinating, or supervising one or more of these subject areas, group interaction through informal discussion and exchange-of-idea sessions was encouraged to expand the understanding of these areas for all participants.

Considerable attention was given to educational administration topics related to organizational problems, administrative functions, supervision, and curriculum development. When applicable, administrative topics were also examined in view of any related problems unique to vocational education administration.

Several techniques for presentation and study were used in the different units covered, including lectures, discussions, field trips, case studies, role playing, oral and written reports, seminars, and independent study. Ad hoc committees were formed for each of the major units of study: Leadership Factors, Personal Skills, Socio-Economic Considerations, Human Relations, Industrial Psychology, Organizational Problems and Administrative Functions, and Supervision and Curriculum Development. Participants volunteered for the committee of their choice, each participant serving on at least one ad hoc committee. Each committee chose from its group a chairman and a recording secretary. The committees were responsible for obtaining background material on the speakers, introducing the speakers, and leading discussion periods following formal presentations.

Four standing committees were also established: the Field Trip Committee, the Library and Reference Committee, the Materials Reproduction Committee, and the Social Committee. Each workshop participant served on one of the standing committees. The offices of chairman and recording secretary were rotated, allowing each member an opportunity to put leadership skills into practice.

One day each week was reserved for a field trip. Visits were made to the Governor's Conference on Education and Training, Ferris State College, General Motors Institute and Chevrolet Apprentice School, University of Michigan Data Processing Center, Cleary Business College, Michigan Rehabilitation Institute, Michigan Department of Public Instruction, Schoolcraft Community College, and Henry Ford Community College.

Following each field trip, participants were given an opportunity to discuss and evaluate the trip, particularly in terms of its value to them as future vocational education administrators. Results of these evaluation sessions were collected by the Field Trip Committee and retained for reference in selecting trips for future workshop groups.

b. The Internship Program and Monthly Seminars

Beginning in the fall of 1964, both groups A and B were involved in an internship program designed to provide them with directed experiences in administration or supervision. The 40 interns met at Ann Arbor in October. They were then divided into three groups, according to their geographical location in the state, and each group met thereafter one day each month with members of the project staff at Ann Arbor, Grand Rapids, or Marquette, to exchange ideas and experiences concerning the internship, to discuss specific problems, and to study new developments and trends. Guest speakers were utilized whenever desirable and possible.

Agreed-upon objectives of the internship program were:

(1) To enable the intern to benefit by the accumulated experience of an administrator.

(2) To assist the intern in gaining knowledge of vocational and technical fields other than his own specialty.

(3) To provide the intern with further knowledge of his community.

(4) To better acquaint the intern with the administrative operation of his own school.

(5) To provide an experience whereby the intern could assess his own strong and weak points.

(6) To help the intern become better acquainted in his community and to assist him in gaining professional stature in the eyes of his colleagues.

Interns were provided experiences and involvements, both in their own schools and in others, which were planned to make their internships more meaningful through increased knowledge and development of attitudes vital to an administrator. They visited outstanding industrial arts and vocational education departments, adult education programs,apprenticeship and cooperative training programs, and government and community organizations such as branch offices of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, local Chambers of Commerce, labor unions, service clubs, and boards of education meetings. In addition, they observed in action special programs and projects such as area redevelopment, manpower training, nurses training, anti-poverty programs, and terminal-technical education programs at the community college level. Some attended P.T.A. meetings and advisory committee meetings, and visited with vocational counselors and guidance personnel.

At the same time, interns were involved in many new activities of an administrative nature, such as surveys of labor requirements, studies of dropouts and follow-up studies. Many became involved in administrative responsibilities through work with administrators in the development and improvement of programs in instruction. (See Appendix E, pp. 65-67)

During the fall semester (1964), interns also took part in the gathering of data for a University of Michigan study to determine what kinds of responsibilities high school principals would assign to an assistant responsible for occupationally oriented programs in the high schools, should such an assistant be provided (Wenrich and Shaffer, 1965).

Using an interview guide, the 40 interns in groups A and B interviewed 120 high school principals in Michigan. They returned the data and an evaluation of the experience provided by the interview session to the University for tabulation. Many of the interns felt that the opportunity to visit and exchange ideas with several high school principals concerning vocational-technical issues in the public schools was one of the more valuable experiences provided during the internship program.

3. TENTATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

a. Participant Evaluation of the Summer Workshop

At the end of the 1964 summer workshop, participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

(1) Having been a member of the Leadership Development Summer Workshop, would you advise others to do the same if given the opportunity?

(2) In what areas do you feel the workshop made the most significant contributions to your professional growth?

(3) Which elements of the workshop did you find the least worthwhile?

(4) What suggestions would you make for future workshops, in terms of course content?

(5) What would you suggest as the most appropriate length of time for the workshop in terms of weeks?

(6) What would you suggest as the most appropriate length of time for the workshop in terms of hours per day?

The more obvious conclusions which can be drawn from the responses to this questionnaire are that:

(1) All members considered the program worthwhile and would advise others to take advantage of the same experience if given the chance.

(2) Nineteen of the 20 participants felt that the most significant benefit of the program was an increased understanding of the total vocational education program.

(3) No one element of the program was considered unmeritorious enough to deserve mention by more than five of the participants.

(4) Under question 4, participants suggested 34 additions to the course content, as opposed to 15 deletions.

The more often mentioned recommendations for future such programs, based on the responses of the 20 participants to question 4, include the following:

(1) The number of consultants could be reduced and the resulting time used in concentrated group discussion and evaluation of the information presented by various consultants.

(2) Classroom facilities were cramped and need to be improved.

(3) Participants felt that more time should be spent on "live" situation projects, such as occupational surveys.

(4) Some participants felt that eight weeks was too little time to cope with the wealth of information presented to them during the workshop. (See Appendix G, pp. 75-79 for a complete analysis)

b. Evaluation of Internship Involvement

One major objective of the first project was to arrange active participation by members of both groups in the kinds of activities with which vocational-technical administrators are involved and with which they spend a large portion of their time. During the second half of the internship, 40 percent of the interns were involved in follow-up studies; slightly over 30 percent were working with cooperative training programs and area surveys; 25 percent were involved in implementation of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, or area programs of vocational-technical education. (See Appendix F, pp. 69-73)

During the same period, interns completed a total of 598 visitations. That number does not necessarily represent 598 separate trips, as some of the trips were multipurpose; on a given trip, a number of departments or activities might have been visited. Activities visited most frequently by interns included: Day Trade Vocational Education programs, Industrial Arts Laboratories, Cooperative Trade and Industrial programs, Cooperative Distributive Programs, and High School Total Community Programs. (See Appendix H, pp. 81-82)

c. Participant Evaluation of Internships, Field Experiences, and Monthly Seminars

At the close of the Leadership Development Project (April 1965), all 40 interns were asked to fill out an evaluation sheet. Three questions were asked:

(1) What phase of your internship involvement do you consider most valuable in terms of growth and development in leadership and administration of vocational and/or technical education?

(2) In order to make the internship and field experience more effective in the future, what changes, additions, or deletions would you suggest?

(3) Having been a member of the Leadership Development Internship and Field Experience group, would you advise others to participate if given the opportunity?

A space was provided after each question to allow the respondent to answer. Interns were requested not to sign their names.

Phases of internship involvement considered most valuable. The responses most frequently given centered around two categories:

(1) Direct involvement in school administration. Typical responses relative to this item were as follows:

  (a) Planning new vocational education programs

  (b) Writing proposals for state or federal reimbursable programs

  (c) Participating in local or area occupational surveys

  (d) Working directly with school administrators

  (e) Visitation of other schools and other vocational programs

  (f) Interviews with high school principals relative to their image of the role of an assistant for vocational education

(2) Informational content of monthly seminars. Typical responses relative to this item were as follows:

(a) State and federal vocational education legislation

(b) Survey techniques

(c) Problems in vocational education

(d) Exposure to ideas and experiences relating to vocational education presented and exchanged by participants

(e) Insights into other areas of vocational education other than their own specialty

Suggestions for improvement of future internship programs. The most frequent suggestion dealt with the need for a more structured internship program—individually planned to give the intern a meaningful and adequate leadership experience, approved by the local school administration, with assurance of released time for internship activity. A need was felt by interns for follow-up visits on the job by University coordinators to assist in problems and to insure a closer liaison between the University and the public school administration.

Several interns suggested that group field trips to outstanding vocational programs be included as part of the seminar.

Recommendation to others. Out of 35 responding to this question, 32 responded with an unqualified "yes." Three qualified their "yes" with recommendations such as, "The person should be willing to work," "Should have complete orientation to the project before he must make up his mind," etc. None answered "no."

A few responded to this questionnaire in terms of the summer workshop, which this instrument was not designed to include. Comments received indicated that these participants believed the summer workshop to be the most important phase, and suggested improvements which involved fewer class hours, more time for individual research, fewer guest speakers, and more student involvements in constructive projects.

d. Effectiveness of Developmental Phase of the Program

(1) As measured by tests:

Of the five tests administered to the 99 candidates who took part in the testing and interviewing phase of the project in March 1964, post-tests were administered to the 40 participants in groups A and B for only two, the Public Opinion Questionnaire and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The POQ is a revised edition of the California-F Scale used for measuring authoritarianism vs. equalitarianism. A positive score indicates a preference for authority and authoritarian attitudes, while a negative score indicates a preference for democratic attitudes and processes. Although there were no significant differences between groups A and B or between the pre-test and post-test, there were a number of changes as shown in Table 3. Twenty-eight (70 percent) of the participants taking the post-test had moved toward the equalitarian position, while only 11 (27.5 percent) had moved toward the authoritarian. One subject made no change. Of the 11 who moved toward the authoritarian position, only 1 had a total positive score on the post-test. The other 10 had only moved somewhat toward the position of authoritarianism, and their total post-test scores were still negative, or equalitarian. Of the 8 subjects who had a positive (authoritarian) score on the pre-test, 4 (50 percent) moved to a negative (equalitarian or democratic) score on the post-test. Only 1 of the remaining 4 moved toward a stronger authoritarian position.

Assuming that democratic attitudes are more in line with present-day educational administration theory, the project experience would seem to have had an overall favorable effect on the participants, in that a majority of them indicated more support for the democratic approach on the post-test than they did on the pre-test.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was designed primarily as an instrument for research and counseling purposes, to provide quick and convenient measures of a number of relative independent normal personality variables. Unlike many personality inventories, the EPPS does not purport to measure clinical and psychiatric syndromes. Instead, it is designed to measure normal personality variables while minimizing the effects of social desirability.

The EPPS measures 15 personality variables: achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression. In addition to the 15 personality variables, the EPPS provides a measure of test consistence.

The pre-test was administered to all 99 candidates invited to Ann Arbor for testing and interviewing in March 1964. The post-test was given to the 40 selectees (groups A and B) in April 1965, at the end of the project. The statistical analysis was confined to the 40 participants and was concerned with both the pre-test and post-test data.

The norms used were based on general adult samples (male). Table 4 contains a percentile analysis for the 16 variables.

The percentile corresponding to a given score is the measure of the score's relative position in the complete distribution of scores for the normative group.

TABLE 3

PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES FOR THE FORTY PARTICIPANTS

Participant Number	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Amount of Change	Rank on Basis of Change
39	- 9	-46	-37	1
33	- 8	-40	-32	2
57	- 6	-36	-30	3
63	-13	-42	-29	4.5
7	+20	- 9	-29	4.5
3	+ 4	-20	-24	6
13	-47	-70	-23	8
36	-11	-34	-23	8
68	-36	-59	-23	8
50	-23	-44	-21	10
48	+ 2	-11	-13	11
25	-38	-49	-11	12.5
81	-12	-23	-11	12.5
20	+23	+13	-10	14
45	-28	-36	- 8	16.5
75	-29	-37	- 8	16.5
90	-52	-60	- 8	16.5
38	-13	-21	- 8	16.5
73	-29	-36	- 7	19
82	-35	-41	- 6	20.5
10	-18	-24	- 6	20.5
67	+ 2	- 3	- 5	22.5
88	-19	-24	- 5	22.5
58	-21	-24	- 3	24
18	+10	+ 9	- 1	26.5
43	-34	-35	- 1	26.5
54	-27	-28	- 1	26.5
92	-19	-20	- 1	26.5
1	+ 2	+ 2	0	29
55	- 8	- 7	+ 1	30
41	-35	-33	+ 2	31
42	+ 1	+ 4	+ 3	32.5
51	-11	- 8	+ 3	32.5
56	-16	- 9	+ 7	34
8	-21	-13	+ 8	35
46	-58	-49	+ 9	36
86	-30	-18	+12	37
5	-30	-16	+14	38
21	-27	- 9	+18	39
52	-60	-36	+24	40

TABLE 4

PERCENTILE ANALYSIS OF SCORES ON THE EPPS FOR THE FORTY PARTICIPANTS

(Pre-test and Post-test)

		Percentiles			
		Pre-test		Post-test	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
1.	Dominance	90.48	1-99	88.48	33-99
2.	Intraception	80.63	6-99	68.38	0-99
3.	Change	71.53	18-98	71.08	18-99
4.	Achievement	67.28	1-99	63.65	4-98
5.	Exhibition	63.05	1-97	63.85	14-98
6.	Affiliation	53.33	8-99	52.30	5-97
7.	Heterosexuality	53.23	20-89	67.08	15-99
8.	Deference	48.03	2-71	48.20	4-97
9.	Aggression	41.18	5-94	47.20	1-98
10.	Autonomy	36.88	2-95	42.58	3-95
11.	Endurance	36.55	1-90	33.28	0-90
12.	Nurturance	35.25	0-90	36.53	2-93
13.	Succorance	33.78	1-83	38.30	8-87
14.	Order	33.48	1-83	34.90	0-83
15.	Abasement	33.78	1-81	26.43	0-81
16.	Consistency	4.08	0-29	55.18	1-97

No attempt will be made to define precisely just what constitutes a high or low percentile on any of the personality variables. It is felt that this is something that each user of the EPPS can determine best for the particular group under observation and in terms of his own objectives.

In general, the following interpretations can be made:

Dominance (pre-test and post-test) was the only variable which could be classified as above average.

In the analysis of variance, in only one instance, the pre-test score on Exhibition, was there found any significant difference at either the .05 or .01 level. The F-ratio in this case was found to be 4.50, which indicated significance at the .05 level. ($F_{.05} = 4.10$; $F_{.01} = 7.35$.) In other words, at the beginning of the experiment, group A was significantly higher than group B in its identification with Exhibitionism.

In the analysis of covariance, a comparison of the means between the pre-test and post-test personality variables revealed nothing of significance.

Analysis of correlation revealed a positive correlation for all variables. Given a total sample size of 40, a correlation coefficient of about .390 would be statistically significant from 0 at the 1 percent level.

If a subject obtains a low consistency score, say less than 9, his scores on the 15 personality variables may be questioned. Therefore, since only 3 scores exceeded 8 and none exceeded 10 in this study, it seems safe to conclude that the results of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (pre-test) are of questionable value as a counseling tool for the project participants.

Little clinical significance has yet been discovered for occasional low consistency scores for given individuals. Sometimes these seem related to attempts to "fake"; sometimes they seem related to a lack of sharply defined attitudes; sometimes they appear to reflect the individual's irritation with the difficult forced choices the EPPS demands.

A complete analysis of the results of the EPPS results has been made (Hodges, 1965) and is available upon request.

(2) As implied by administrators' ratings of interns:

On completion of the first semester of internship (December 1964), the immediate supervisor of each intern was mailed a questionnaire asking him to rate the intern's performance in the following four categories:

(a) Competence in understanding and working with people.

(b) Comprehensive understanding of the total area of vocational-technical education.

(c) Demonstrated possession of desirable leadership competencies.

(d) Persistence and industry.

Interns were to be rated according to the following scale:

Average	Slightly Above Average	Above Average	Considerable Above Average	Superior
1	2	3	4	5

Ratings which did not fall directly on the whole numbers were weighted according to their position on the scale.

A summary of the supervisors' ratings reveals the following:

(a) The average ratings of group A were higher than those of group B for all four categories.

(b) Both groups rated highest in the fourth category (Persistence and Industry).

(c) The lowest rating for group A was in the second category (comprehensive understanding of the total area of vocational and technical education), though group A rated higher in this category than did group B.

(d) Lowest rating for group B was in category one (competence in understanding and working with people) and category three (demonstrated possession of desirable leadership competencies).

(e) Lowest average individual rating was in group B (2.1275).

(3) As implied by participants' changes in position and increased responsibility:

In terms of the major objective of the project, that of preparing persons to fill positions of leadership in vocational-technical education in Michigan, the results of the experimental project completed in June 1965 are most encouraging and would seem to justify the continuation of the program as a means of preparing additional persons for leadership roles. Already, nearly two-thirds of the men in the project have moved to more responsible positions. Thirteen have been promoted within the school system in which they were originally employed, while 13 others have taken leadership positions in other school systems. Of the remaining 14 men in the project, 8 have been given administrative duties and responsibilities on a part-time basis, in addition to their original assignments. Only 6 of the 40 men in the project had, as of June 1965, assumed no new responsibilities for leadership in vocational-technical education.

However, it is recognized that a long-range evaluation, based upon performance over a period of several years of those persons who participated in the experimental project, would seem to be desirable. Such a study has been initiated, and through that study it is hoped that the validity of the criteria which have been used in the selection of persons for the program can be determined. It is also hoped that through this long-range follow-up study, we might expect to get additional information which will be useful in refining the developmental aspects of the program.

The follow-up study will be made annually for the next three years to gather information on the performance of those who have participated in both the experimental and the control groups of the Michigan Leadership Development Program. Included in the study will be a second control group consisting of 20 persons randomly selected from those applicants who passed the preliminary screening but were not included in the final group of 40 program participants. The follow-up study will also include the 20 persons in the program during the 1965-66 school year and those who will be selected for the program during subsequent years. It is planned to do the final follow-up study by interviews. Performance criteria to be used might include the kinds of positions held, the scope and nature of duties and responsibilities assigned, ratings by superordinates and subordinates, and salary earned.

IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

A. Selection Criteria

Although a study (Richens, 1965) conducted during the summer workshop period and the early fall of 1964 revealed little correlation between the original selective process and current subjective views by group members, instructors, and field supervisors concerning the qualifications and predicted success of individual participants, it is hoped that data collected in connection with that study will be most valuable in a comparison of a second group, developed, selected, and evaluated by the same criteria. Such a comparison is planned as part of the longitudinal study mentioned earlier in this report.

However, even though a thorough evaluation of the criteria used for the selection of the first 40 members of The University of Michigan Leadership Development Project will not be possible until the conclusion of the long-range study, there would seem at this time to be little reason for considering the selection processes less than successful. Certainly, members of the University staff associated with the project have been impressed by the highly "select" nature of the participants: their high-achievement drive, professional awareness and competency in the field, and their demonstrated above-average level of intelligence. One objective of the long-range study is the identification of those factors which are most critical to the successful initial selection of candidates for such projects.

At the same time, members of both groups were rated very highly by their immediate supervisors during the internship phase of the study. A majority of the group of 40 participants have assumed positions of increased responsibility since completing the program.

B. Program Development

After a survey of the literature (discussed in Part I,B of this report) for any existing guidelines for such a project, content for the workshop and internship programs was developed around the central concept of an interdisciplinary approach to leadership. Participants were exposed to as many recognized leaders in a wide range of fields as time allowed. An attempt was made to increase the participants' knowledge of the total spectrum of public education and of specific areas such as administration, supervision, organization, and curriculum development techniques. Knowledge of and skill in human relations was both studied in the classroom and practiced through "live" situation assignments during both the workshop and internship phase of the program.

As implied under Part III,B,3,a of this report titled, "Participant Evaluation of the Summer Workshop," participants suggested some content changes for future programs. Some of these suggestions were incorporated into the development of the program for the following year. For example, more time was devoted to field work in "live" situations, concentrated group discussions, and individual research.

It is hoped that the long-range follow-up and evaluative study will be of assistance in further refinement of the program and in establishing well-defined criteria for evaluation of the various elements of the program for both workshop and internship phases of the project.

C. Conclusions

Based upon the opinions of the participants and of their immediate supervisors at the time of their participation, and upon the large number of the original group of 40 whose responsibilities for leadership in vocational-technical education have increased markedly since their participation in the project, the first University of Michigan Leadership Development Project in Vocational-Technical Education has accomplished the major part of its objectives.

Administrators and others concerned with hiring persons for leadership positions in vocational-technical education have indicated that they place considerable confidence in the project for preparing persons to better meet the demands of such positions.

Using local school administrators as a source of nominees for this project proved to be advantageous during the internship phase of the project. Administrators felt informed and involved and were most cooperative in assisting to arrange meaningful internship experiences for the participants.

Much remains to be learned about the value of standardized tests as selection or counseling tools for such projects.

The requests from other states and, thus far, from one other country point out the acute interest in this type of training program and the critical need for extensive research in the total area of leadership for administrative and supervisory positions in the field of vocational-technical education.

D. Recommendations

In view of the information presented in this report, it is recommended that:

1. The Michigan Leadership Development Project be continued as a source of leadership training for vocational-technical education in the state.
2. An extensive follow-up study of the 40 participants involved in the original experimental project be made.
3. The long-range longitudinal study should be continued, involving the original and subsequent groups of participants, in order to attempt to validate selection criteria used in the screening of applicants for the project and bases for inclusion or exclusion of various forms of program content.
4. Every effort should be made to encourage further research in the area of educational leadership, especially as it concerns the administration of vocational-technical education.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Bass, Edgar M. *Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1960.

Borgatta, Edgar F. "Small Group Research: A Bibliography and Trend Report," *Current Sociology*, Vol. IX, No. 3 (1960), 211-271.

Boyce, R. D. "An Empirical Evaluation of Five Tests for Administrator Selection: The Composite Study." Doctor's thesis, Stanford University, 1960.

Bradford, Leland Powers. *Selected Readings Series: I. Group Development*. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, National Education Association, 1961.

Browne, Clarence George, and Cohn, Thomas S. (eds). *The Study of Leadership*. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin (eds.). *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson & Co., 1953.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin (eds.). *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. 2nd edition. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson & Co., 1960.

Corbally, John E., Jr., *et al*. *Educational Administration: The Secondary School*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961, p. 43.

Darley, John G. "Critique," in *Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior*. Edited by Luigi Petrullo and Bernard M. Bass. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961, 357-366.

Dubin, Robert, *et al*. *Leadership and Productivity: Some Facts of Industrial Life*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965.

Fiedler, Fred E. *Leader Attitudes and Group Effectiveness*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1958.

Gates, Claude L., Jr. "A Study of Administrators of Technical Education Programs in the Public Junior Colleges in the United States," Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Florida State University, 1964 (University Microfilms, 65-315).

Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954, 877-920.

Gouldner, Alvin Ward (ed.). Studies in Leadership: Leadership and Democartic Action. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed.). Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Gross, Neal, and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York, N. Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Guetzkow, Harold (ed.). Groups, Leadership, and Men: Research in Human Relations. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Carnegie Press, 1951 (1962 reprint, distributed by Rutgers University Press).

Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1956. (Reprinted, 1959, by Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago.)

Hare, Alexander Paul. Handbook of Small Group Research. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Hare, Alexander Paul, Borgatta, Edgar F., and Bales, Robert F. Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction. Revised edition, 1966. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Hemphill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E., and Frederikson, Norman. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1962.

Hemphill, John K. Situational Factors in Leadership. Monograph No. 32. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, The Ohio State University, 1949.

Hodges, Lewis H. An Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Given to All Participants (Groups A and B) of the Leadership Development Project for Vocational and Technical Education (unpublished study, 1965).

Hollander, Edwin Paul. Leaders, Groups, and Influence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964

Hollingworth, L. S. Gifted Children. New York: Macmillan, 1926, p. 131.

Jenkins, William P. "A Review of Leadership Studies with Particular Reference to Military Problems," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. XLIV (January, 1947), 54-77.

Kornhauser, William. *Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1963.

Krech, David, Crutchfield, Richard S., and Ballachey, Egerton L. *Individual in Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Lasswell, Harold D. *Power and Personality*. New York: Viking Press, 1948.

Lawrence, Paul R., *et al*. *Organizational Behavior and Administration*. Revised edition. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin and Dorsey, 1965.

Likert, Rensis. *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

Lindzey, Gardner (ed). *Handbook of Social Psychology*. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Lipman, James M. "Personal Variables in Effective Administrators," *Administrator's Notebook*, Vol. II, No. 1 (September 1960), 1-4.

Lippitt, Gordon L. (ed.). *Leadership in Action*. Selected Readings Series, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, National Education Association, 1961.

Luckie, William Ronald. "Leader Behavior of Directors of Instruction." E.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1963. (*Dissertation Abstracts*, Vol. 25 (September 1964), 1690-91).

McCleary, Lloyd E., and Hencley, Stephen P. *Secondary School Administration*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1965.

Marcson, Simon. *The Scientist in American Industry*. Princeton: Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, 1958.

Meece, E. L., and Eckel, C. H. *Experimentation in Preparing School Leaders*, Bulletin, Bureau of School Services, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Vol. 23, No. 4 (June 1961), p. 6.

Moore, Hollis A., Jr. *Studies in School Administration*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957.

Petrullo, Luigi, and Bass, Bernard M. (eds.). *Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Redl, F. "Group Emotion and Leadership," *Psychiatry* (1942), 5, 573-596.

Richens, George L. *A Report on the Evaluation of the Selection Process of the Leadership Development Project for Vocational and Technical Education* (unpublished University of Michigan Graduate Study, 1965).

Saunders, Robert L., Phillips, Ray C., and Johnson, Harold T. *A Theory of Educational Leadership*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

Seeman, Melvin. *Social Status and Leadership: The Case of the School Executive*. Educational Research Monograph No. 35. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, The Ohio State University, 1960.

Selznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration*. Evanston, Ill." Row, Peterson & Co., 1957.

Shartle, Carroll L. *Executive Performance and Leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

Smith, Henry Lester, and Krueger, Levi McKinley. *A Brief Summary of Literature on Leadership*. Vol. IX, No. 4 of the *Bulletin of the School of Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Bureau of Cooperative Research, Indiana University, 1933.

Sorokin, Pitrim. *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956 (Gateway edition, 1965).

Stogdill, Ralph M. *Individual Behavior and Group Achievement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Stogdill, Ralph M., and Coons, Alvin S. (eds.). *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, Ohio: The Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, 1957.

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. XXV (January 1948), 35-71.

Tannenbaum, Robert, Weschler, Irving R.,and Massarik, Fred. *Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

Tead, Ordway. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Brittanica, Inc., 1957.

United States Office of Education. *Education for a Changing World of Work*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963, p. 162.

Webster's New International Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1957.

Wenrich, Ralph C., and Ollenburger, Alvin. *High Schools Principals' Perceptions of Assistance Needed in Order to Develop More Adequate Programs for Employment-Bound Youth*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, 1963.

Wenrich, Ralph C., and Shaffer, Earl W. *High School Principals' Perceptions of the Roles and Responsibilities of Persons Who Would be Charged with the Responsibility for Leadership in the Development of Occupationally Oriented Programs in High Schools*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, September 1965.

White, Ralph, and Lippitt, Ronald. *Autocracy and Democracy, and Experimental Inquiry*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1960.

White, Ralph, and Lippitt, Ronald. "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three 'Social Climates,'" in Cartwright and Zander (eds.), *Group Dynamics*, 1st edition, 1953, pp. 584-611; 2nd edition, 1960, pp. 527-553.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Anderson, Lester W., and Van Dyke, Lauren A. *Secondary School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Barnes, L. B. *Organizational Systems and Engineering Groups: A Comparative Study of Two Technical Groups in Industry.* Boston: Division of Research, Harvard Business School, Harvard University,1960. (Digested in Lawrence, Paul R., *et al. Organizational Behavior and Administration.* Revised edition. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin and Dorsey, 1965, 199-201.)

Boulding, Kenneth. *The Organizational Revolution.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.

Campbell, Roald, and Gregg, Russell. *Administrative Behavior in Education.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Hencley, Stephen P. (eds.). *Educational Research: New Perspectives.* Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Hencley, Stephen R. (eds.). *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Culbertson, Jack, Jacobsen, Paul, and Reller, Theodore. *Administrative Relations.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Gross, Bertram M. *The Managing of Organizations: The Administrative Struggle.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Halpin, Andrew W., and Croft, Don B. *The Organizational Climate of Schools.* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education (Contract SAE 543 (8939)-U.S.O.E.), 1962.

Hencley, Stephen P. (ed.). *Research in Educational Administration.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Leu, Donald J., and Rudman, Herbert C. *Preparation Programs for School Administrators.* East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1963.

Rice, Kenneth. *Learning for Leadership.* London: Tavistock Publications, 1965.

Weschler, Irving R. *Inside a Sensitivity Training Group.* Los Angeles: Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, 1959.

Weschler, Irving R., and Scheim, Edgar H. *Issues in Human Relations Training*. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, National Educational Association, 1962.

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND PRACTICAL ARTS

DATE: February 5, 1964

TO: Selected Local School Administrators in Michigan, including Superintendents, High School Principals, Community College Deans, and Directors of Vocational Education

FROM: Ralph C. Wenrich, Chairman, Department of Vocational Education and Practical Arts

SUBJECT: Experimental Program for the Development of Persons for Leadership Roles in the Administration and Supervision of Vocational and Technical Education

Society is looking to the schools to help solve many of its problems including high unemployment among youth, increasing juvenile delinquency and school drop-outs. The needs of employment-bound youth (as distinguished from the needs of college-bound youth) are being discussed by many groups. Federal legislation (the Vocational Education Act of 1963) has been passed and in all probability this session of the Michigan Legislature will also deal with the problem of education for employment of both youth and adults.

Any school administrator who has had to find someone for a leadership position recently knows that there is a critical shortage of persons qualified to fill such positions. Due to recent and anticipated developments, we can expect that the shortage will become even more acute.

The future development of vocational and technical education programs for emplyment-bound youth and adults will depend to a large extent upon the supply of qualified persons for a variety of leadership roles. The University of Michigan, with the co-operation of the Michigan Department of Public Instruction, has therefore launched an experimental program for the selection and development of persons with high potential for leadership in the administration and supervision of vocational and technical education.

Twenty teachers, counselors or administrators with a background in business, industrial, agricultural, or technical education will be invited to Ann Arbor for an eight-week summer workshop (starting June 18) which is the first phase of the experimental program. The second phase of the program would provide for an internship experience during the school year 1964-65.

In order to develop a list of candidates for this program, we are asking your co-operation by recommending a person (or persons) from your school or school system who in your opinion have high leadership potential and should be considered for this project.

It would be appreciated if you complete the enclosed nomination form prior to February 12. We welcome any comments or questions that you might have concerning the project.

RCW:pb
Enclosures

S P D

NOMINATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

1. Do you have a person(s) with a background in agricultural, business, or industrial education in your school (or school system) whom you wish to recommend for the Leadership Development Project?

   ☐ No (skip to Question 4)

   ☐ Yes (answer Questions 2 and 3)

2. Would you please list the name(s) of the nominee(s) below:

   NAME ADDRESS

   ____

   ____

   ____

3. If you have listed nominees above, would you consider using one or more of these persons in an administrative and/or supervisory position in your school (or school system) after they have completed their leadership training program?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Whether or not you have recommended someone for the project, would you be willing to explore the possibility of using one of the men in the project on an internship basis during the school year 1964-65?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do you have a need, or do you foresee a need in the near future for an administrator, supervisor, or consultant in vocational and/or technical education?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   If so, describe briefly the position and indicate approximately when you will need someone.

   Position title or description ________________________

   When needed ________

Note:

We appreciate your help in responding to the above questions. Would you be willing to give us three more minutes of your time to answer the question on the next page?

S P D

ATTRIBUTES, EXPERIENCE AND COMPETENCIES ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

The literature makes it quite clear that persons in leadership roles should have certain physical, mental and social attributes. For example, he should have good health, above-average energy, and above-average intelligence. Frequently such traits as insight, flexibility, adaptability, originality, initiative, ambition, and sociability are mentioned as desirable. Also a person to be a leader should have certain qualities of character including honesty, morality, loyalty, and integrity. He should also be able to work with people, both on an individual basis and in large and small groups. Finally he must know and understand education in general and vocational-technical education in particular. If you were looking for a person to fill a leadership position in vocational-technical education, what particular attributes or other qualities in addition to those mentioned above would you want him to possess?

1. What personal attributes or character traits?

____

____

____

____

2. What background of experience?

____

____

____

____

3. What special skills or knowledge?

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48104

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND PRACTICAL ARTS

DATE: February 11, 1964

TO: Persons Who Have Been Nominated for Participation in the Leadership Development Project

FROM: Ralph C. Wenrich, Chairman
Department of Vocational Education and Practical Arts

SUBJECT: Request for Personal Data from Individuals Who Have Been Nominated and Wish to be Considered

Local school administrators--high school principals, community college deans, vocational directors and superintendents--were recently invited to nominate persons in their schools with a background of experience in agricultural, business or industrial education who have high leadership potential. You were one of those nominated and therefore are being considered to participate in an experimental program for the identification, selection and development of persons with potential for leadership roles in the administration and supervision of vocational and technical education.

Recent developments in the field of vocational and technical education have created a critical shortage of qualified persons for a variety of leadership roles. In the past few months this need has been demonstrated by the many requests received for qualified persons to fill administrative and supervisory positions, such as assistant deanships in Michigan community colleges, consultants in intermediate school districts, local directorships and others. In view of this critical problem The University of Michigan, with the cooperation of the State Department of Public Instruction, has launched a leadership development program.

Selected teachers, counselors and administrators with a background in business, industrial, agricultural or technical education will be invited to come to Ann Arbor next summer for an eight-week workshop especially designed to prepare them for leadership roles; the workshop participants may register for a maximum of eight semester hours of credit at The University of Michigan. It is hoped that scholarships (possibly $500 plus additional amounts for dependents) will be available to all participants of the eight-week workshop. It is also planned to make arrangements so that those who complete the workshop will have an opportunity to get experience in an administrative or supervisory position during the school year 1964-65, either in their own school system or in some other system, possibly on a part-time basis.

The attached form is designed to gather data on those individuals who have been nominated and are interested in being further considered as candidates for the leadership development project. If you have no interest in the project, you need not respond.

If interested, it is necessary for you to complete this form prior to February 24 and return it to Ralph C. Wenrich, School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. We welcome any comments or questions that you may have concerning any aspect of the project.

The University of Michigan

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Please answer the following questions and return the form, no later than February 24, 1964, to Ralph C. Wenrich, School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

1. Name and Home Address ____

____

2. Would you be interested in being further considered as a candidate for the Leadership Development Project at The University of Michigan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Would you be interested in participating in the eight-week workshop in leadership development next summer as a part of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, would you participate whether or not you receive any financial support from the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Would you be willing to come to Ann Arbor for a day at your own expense during the month of March to be interviewed and take a battery of tests as a part of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, circle the dates that you would like to come.

March 9 March 10 March 11 March 12 March 13 March 16

(All interviewing and testing must be done on these dates.)

5. If you were to be finally selected for the program, would you be willing to participate in an on-the-job experience in an administrative or supervisory position during the school year 1964-65?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. If you are finally selected for the eight-week workshop, would you be willing to live in Ann Arbor for these weeks (with the exception of week ends)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, and if you have a family, will you bring the members of your family to Ann Arbor?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. The selected participants will be divided into two groups: (1) an experimental and (2) a control group. The experimental group will participate in the eight-week workshop, while the control group will not. Both groups, however, will be tested, interviewed and followed up in the same manner. Would you be interested in participating in either group or just the experimental group?

☐ Experimental group, only

☐ Control group, only

☐ Either group

8. Date of your birth: ____________________

9. Your marital status: ☐ Single ☐ Married ☐ Widowed

10. Number of children you have: ________

11. Have you completed any course work beyond your last degree?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how many semester hours? ________

At what institution? ____________________

12. Have you completed the above work toward an advanced degree?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, for what degree? ____________________

13. What type of certificate do you now hold?

☐ Secondary Provisional ☐ Vocational

☐ Secondary Permanent Other ____________________

14. What subject(s) appear on your certificate?

____

15. What degree(s) do you hold? When did you receive them? From what institution?

Degree	Date Received	Name of Institution

16. Your present position and business address:

Title of position (if teacher, give subject taught) ____________________

School (or school system) ____________________

Address ____________________

____

17. Give full name and address of your present immediate supervisor.

18. Former experience in schools (teaching, counseling, etc.)

Name of School & Location	Type of Position	Level and Subject Taught	Dates	
			From	To

19. Give full name and address of your immediate supervisor in former teaching position(s), if any.

20. Kind and amount of work experience in business, industry, agriculture and/or military service you may have had.

Title of Positions Held	Name and Address of Firm	Dates	
		From	To

21. Give full name and address of your supervisor in business, industry, agriculture, and/or military service for whom you have worked most recently.

22. List the professional associations in which you hold membership and describe your participation in each (1) as an officer or committeeman and (2) in the meetings or conventions as a program chairman, speaker, etc.

Associations	Nature of Participation

23. List all honors and awards (such as honorary memberships, scholarships, or other kind of awards) you have received.

Kind of Award	When Received	By Whom Granted

24. List any leadership roles in your school or community which you now hold or have held in the past (such as committee chairmanship, offices held in organizations, or other elected or appointed positions in the school or in the community).

Leadership Position Held	When Held	Appointed or Elected

25. The following space is reserved for any additional information that you would like to add (you may include any contributions to your profession, or any professional activities not reported elsewhere in this form).

APPENDIX C

Date ____________________ Name ________________________________

INTERVIEW GUIDE

	Out-standing	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Can't say
1. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE CANDIDATE'S GENERAL APPEARANCE? (Consider dress; grooming; bearing; physical defects, if any, etc.)						
2. WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF THE CANDIDATE'S ENTHUSIASM? (Consider his attitude toward this project; his outlook toward his profession; purpose in life, etc.)						
3. WHAT WAS THE QUALITY OF HIS TEACHING EXPERIENCE? (Consider the relationship of his teaching experience to the needs of employment-bound youth; satisfactions from teaching; relationships and rapport with students and others, etc.)						
4. WHAT WAS THE QUALITY OF HIS WORK EXPERIENCE OTHER THAN TEACHING? (Consider the contribution of work experience to his effectiveness as a teacher; was it a satisfying experience? Is the work experience reported accurate (see item 20 on personal data form in candidate's folder)?)						
5. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE CANDIDATE'S GOALS AND ASPIRATIONS? (Consider his reasons for being interested in this project; the realistic nature of his goals, etc.)						
6. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE CANDIDATE'S COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS? (Consider ability to express himself; proper English usage; fluency, etc.)						
7. WHAT WAS THE CANDIDATE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE INTERVIEW AND THE INTERVIEWER?						
8. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE CANDIDATE'S LEVEL OF MATURITY? (Consider his self-understanding, judgment, and rationality.)						

-:-

Overall appraisal (Check one)

_____ Recommended very highly
_____ Recommended highly
_____ Recommended
_____ Recommended with reservations
_____ Not recommended

Comments:

Signature of Interviewer ______________________________

-:-

If you are accepted for the project and are in the experimental (workshop) group, would you plan to live in Ann Arbor? Yes ____ No ____

If you are accepted for the project, would you be willing to come to Ann Arbor four times a semester as a part of your internship? Yes ____ No ____

APPENDIX D

Name ____________________________________

The University of Michigan

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
for
Vocational and Technical Education

TEST D, PART I

1. What type of leadership position are you most interested in preparing for?

    ____

2. List as many traits or personal characteristics as you can that you feel would be important for the position you specified in item 1.

    1. ____
    2. ____
    3. ____
    4. ____
    5. ____
    6. ____
    7. ____
    8. ____
    9. ____
    10. ____
    11. ____
    12. ____
    13. ____
    14. ____
    15. ____

3. After you have finished your list (under item 2 above), place a check in front of the three items you feel are the most important.

Name ______________________________

The University of Michigan

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
for
Vocational and Technical Education

TEST D, PART II

Directions: In your estimation, how important is each of the following items as it might relate to you in the leadership position which you indicated in Item I, Part I interests you most. Check each item "very important", "somewhat important", or "not very important".

				Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important
1.	a.	To do one's best	a.			
	b.	To be successful	b.			
	c.	To accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort	c.			
	d.	To be a recognized authority	d.			
	e.	To accomplish something of great significance	e.			
2.	a.	To accept the leadership of others	a.			
	b.	To read about great men	b.			
	c.	To conform to custom and avoid the unconventional	c.			
	d.	To let others make decisions	d.			
3.	a.	To have written work neat and organized	a.			
	b.	To make plans before starting on a difficult task	b.			
	c.	To have things organized	c.			
	d.	To keep things neat and orderly	d.			
4.	a.	To say witty and clever things	a.			
	b.	To tell amusing jokes and stories	b.			
	c.	To talk about personal adventures and experiences	c.			
	d.	To talk about personal achievements	d.			
	e.	To be the center of attention	e.			
5.	a.	To be able to come and go as desired	a.			
	b.	To say what one thinks about things	b.			
	c.	To be independent of others in making decisions	c.			
	d.	To feel free to do what one wants	d.			
6.	a.	To be loyal to friends	a.			
	b.	To participate in friendly groups	b.			
	c.	To do things for friends	c.			
	d.	To form new friendships	d.			
	e.	To make as many friends as possible	e.			
7.	a.	To understand how others feel about problems	a.			
	b.	To put one's self in another's place	b.			
	c.	To judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do.	c.			

			Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important
8.	a.	To seek encouragement from others			
	b.	To have others be kindly			
	c.	To have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems			
	d.	To have others feel sorry when one is sick			
9.	a.	To settle arguments and disputes between others			
	b.	To persuade and influence others to do what one wants			
	c.	To supervise and direct the actions of others			
	d.	To tell others how to do their jobs			
10.	a.	To feel guilty when one does something wrong			
	b.	To feel depressed by inability to handle situations			
	c.	To feel timid in the presence of superiors			
	d.	To feel inferior to others in most respects			
11.	a.	To help friends when they are in trouble			
	b.	To assist others less fortunate			
	c.	To treat others with kindness and sympathy			
	d.	To forgive others			
12.	a.	To do new and different things			
	b.	To travel			
	c.	To meet new people			
	d.	To experience novelty and change in daily routine			
	e.	To experiment and try new things			
13.	a.	To keep at a job until it is finished			
	b.	To complete any job undertaken			
	c.	To work hard at a task			
	d.	To keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved			
14.	a.	To go out with members of the opposite sex			
	b.	To engage in social activities with the opposite sex			
	c.	To be in love with someone of the opposite sex			
15.	a.	To tell others off when disagreeing with them			
	b.	To get revenge for insults			
	c.	To become angry			
	d.	To blame others when things go wrong			
	e.	To read newspaper accounts of violence			

APPENDIX E

REFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME OF CANDIDATE ____

DIRECTIONS: Under each of the following questions check the one phrase which most accurately describes the candidate's habitual behavior with regard to that specific trait. Use the space at the end of each item for any comment you care to make about the candidate as far as that trait is concerned.

A. HOW WELL IS HE ABLE TO DIRECT AND INFLUENCE OTHERS ALONG DEFINITE LINES OF ACTION?

_____ Very successful in leading others.
_____ Normally successful in directing and controlling others.
_____ Poor leader - incapable of directing others.

Comments ____

B. HOW WELL DOES HE WORK WITH ASSOCIATES AND OTHERS FOR THE GOOD OF A GROUP?

_____ Cooperates willingly and actively regardless of self-benefit; makes things go smoothly.
_____ Cooperates with others toward accomplishment of common cause.
_____ Gives limited cooperation; neglects common good for own interests.

Comments ____

C. HOW RESPONSIBLE IS HE? IS HE ABLE TO GET THINGS DONE ON HIS OWN?

_____ Exceptionally able to accomplish work without instructions.
_____ Carries out routine activity on own responsibility.
_____ Usually needs detailed instructions with regular checks of work.

Comments ____

D. HOW DOES HE REACT TO SUGGESTIONS OR CRITICISM BY OTHERS?

_____ Follows suggestions willingly.
_____ Listens to suggestions but may act without considering them.
_____ Resents suggestions and criticism.

Comments ____

E. HOW WELL DOES HE APPLY ATTENTION, ENERGY, AND PERSISTENCE IN FOLLOWING A JOB THROUGH?

_____ Unusual perseverance; does more than expected.
_____ Industrious, energetic; dependable at all times.
_____ Completes assigned tasks of his own accord.
_____ Rather indifferent; does not finish job.
_____ Needs much prodding to complete work.

Comments ____

F. HOW WELL DOES HE PUT HIS PRINCIPLES AND CONVICTIONS INTO ACTION?

_____ Carries out his principles and convictions constantly and boldly even in face of obstacles.
_____ Acts according to his convictions under normal circumstances.
_____ Fails to carry out his convictions under adverse circumstances.

Comments ____

Directions: Please state briefly what you know of the applicant with regard to each of the following items.

WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE POSITION HELD BY THE CANDIDATE WHILE UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION?

Title of Position:

Duties:

DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIS PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC, SERVICE, OR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

_____ Yes _____ No. If yes, please explain.

DO YOU HAVE AN OVERALL IMPRESSION OF HIS LEADERSHIP POTENTIAL FOR DIRECTING VOCATIONAL OR TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS? _____ Yes _____ No. If yes, please explain.

OTHER INFORMATION. (Include here any information that you deem pertinent which has not been asked above, such as discretion, honesty, neatness, companions, integrity, etc.)

How long have you known the candidate? ________________

Are you related to the candidate? _____ Yes _____ No.

If yes, state relationship. ____________________

Signed ______________________________

Your name ______________________________
(printed or typed)

Employed by ______________________________

Position ______________________________

Date ________________.

Since your answer to the foregoing items will have direct bearing upon the selection of this candidate, please immediately return this form in the enclosed envelope.

APPENDIX F

RANK OF INTERNSHIP LEADERSHIP INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES BASED ON FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE AMONG 40 PARTICIPANTS IN THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Interim Report - January 1965)

Rank of Activity	Type of Activity	Participants Reporting	
		Number	Percent
1	Surveys: Area, Community, and Occupational	13	32.5
2	Manpower Development and Training Act Activity	11	27.5
4	Cooperative Training	10	25.0
4	Dropout Study	10	25.0
4	Follow-up Study	10	25.0
6	Adult Education	7	17.5
8	Guidance	6	15.0
8	Trade and Industrial Education	6	15.0
8	Industrial Arts Education	6	15.0
10	Business Education	4	10.0
13	Vocational Agriculture	1	2.5
13	Practical Nursing	1	2.5
13	Commercial Foods Training	1	2.5
13	Home Economics	1	2.5
13	Apprentice Training	1	2.5

RANK OF INTERNSHIP FIELD VISITATIONS BASED ON FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE AMONG 40 PARTICIPANTS IN THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Interim Report-January, 1965)

Rank	Type of Field Visitation	Participants Reporting	
		Number	Percent
1	Cooperative Training: T & I, Office, Distributive	17	42.5
2	Vocational Education Act of 1963 and State Plan Conferences	12	30.0
3.5	Michigan Employment Sceurity Commission Offices	11	27.5
3.5	Industrial Arts Departments	11	27.5
5	High School Administrators	10	25.0
6.5	Vocational-Technical Programs in Community Colleges and Technical Institutes	9	22.5
6.5	Home Economics Laboratories	9	22.5
9	MDTA-ARA Projects	8	20.0
9	Day Trade Programs	8	20.0
9	Industry and Industrial Development Groups	8	20.0
11.5	High School Commercial Departments	7	17.5
11.5	Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce	7	17.5
14	Service Clubs	6	15.0
14	Apprentice Training Programs	6	15.0
14	Adult Extension	6	15.0
16.5	Guidance Staffs	5	12.5
16.5	U-M In-Service Workshop	5	12.5
18	Nurses' Training	4	10.0
19.5	Board of Education	3	7.5
19.5	PTA	3	7.5
21.5	Youth with Special Needs	2	5.0
21.5	Advisory Committees	2	5.0
23	AVA Convention	1	2.5

RANK OF INTERNSHIP LEADERSHIP INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES BASED ON FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE AMONG 40 PARTICIPANTS IN THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
(Winter Term - 1965)

Rank	Type of Activity	Participants Reporting	
		Number	Percent
1	Follow-up Studies	16	40.0
2.5	Cooperative Training Programs	14	35.0
2.5	Surveys: Area, Community and Occupational	14	35.0
4	Trade and Industrial Education	13	32.5
5	Dropout Study	10	25.0
6	Economic Opportunity Act	9	22.5
7.5	Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)	8	20.0
7.5	Area Programs	8	20.0
9.5	Community Programs	6	15.0
9.5	Adult Education	6	15.0
11.5	Business Education	5	12.5
11.5	Industrial Arts Education	5	12.5
13.5	Technical Education	4	10.0
13.5	Guidance	4	10.0
15.5	Nursing Programs	3	7.5
15.5	School Programs	3	7.5
17	Apprenticeship Programs	2	5.0
18.5	Commercial Foods	1	2.5
18.5	Vocational Agriculture Education	1	2.5

RANK OF INTERNSHIP FIELD VISITATIONS BASED ON FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE AMONG 40 PARTICIPANTS IN THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Winter Term - 1965)

Rank	Type of Field Visitation	Participants Reporting	
		Number	Percent
1	Day Trade, Vocational Industrial	20	50.0
2.5	Cooperative T & I (Trade and Industrial Education)	18	45.0
2.5	Industrial Arts	18	45.0
4.5	Cooperative Distributive	16	40.0
4.5	High School Community	16	40.0
6.5	Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)	15	37.5
6.5	Cooperative Office Practice	15	37.5
8	Home Economics	14	35.0
9	Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical	12	30.0
10	Vocational Directors' Workshop	11	27.5
12.5	Adult Extension T & I	9	22.5
12.5	PTA Meeting	9	22.5
12.5	Vocational Agriculture	9	22.5
12.5	Chamber of Commerce, Junior College, Service Clubs	9	22.5
16	Apprentice Training	8	20.0
16	Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESC)	8	20.0
16	Guidance	8	20.0
17	Advisory Committee	7	17.5
20.5	Industry, Business, Industrial	6	15.0
20.5	Development Groups	6	15.0
20.5	Economic Opportunity Act Programs	6	15.0
20.5	Faculty, Board of Education Meeting	6	15.0
20.5	Trade-Technical Conference	6	15.0
24	Nurses Training	5	12.5
25	Labor Unions	2	5.0

APPENDIX G

1964 SUMMER WORKSHOP EVALUATION

TABLE I

RECOMMENDATIONS TO OTHERS

Response	N	Percent
Yes—unqualified	16	80
Yes—qualified	4	20
No	0	0
Totals	20	100

Table I indicates the tabulation of the responses to Question 1: "Having been a member of the Leadership Development Summer Workshop, would you advise others to do the same if given the opportunity?" The following reasons were listed by the four participants who answered "Yes—qualified":

Two respondents mentioned poor physical facilities.
One respondent was dissatisfied with University of Michigan policies concerning transfer of credit.
One respondent felt that too many consultants were of The University of Michigan staff.

TABLE II

AREAS THAT MADE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS

Rank Order of Importance	Areas Listed	Frequency Mentioned
1.	Insight into total vocational education program	19
2.	Leadership skills	13
3.	Knowledge of areas other than vocational education	12
4.	Personal skills	10
5.	Knowledge in your areas of specialization	8

Table II indicates the responses to Question 2; "In what areas do you feel the workshop made the most significant contributions to your professional growth?"

TABLE III

ELEMENTS THAT MADE THE LEAST SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS

Rank Order of Importance	Elements Listed	Frequency Mentioned
1.	Some speakers were uninspiring	5
2.	State reports on vocational education	4
4.5	Too much listening, not enough doing	3
4.5	Time spent listening to tapes	3
4.5	Driver education presentation	3
4.5	Dr. X's presentation	3
7.	The Whitman kits	2
8.	Twelve other items were mentioned only one time each	1

Table III indicates responses to Question 3: "Which elements of the workshop did you find the least worthwhile?"

The nature of the responses to Question 3 seems to indicate that, although all elements of the program made some worthwhile contribution, perhaps some of the time could have been spent to greater advantage, as is brought out in the responses to Question 4.

TABLE IV(a)

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE—ADDITIONS OR CHANGES

Rank Order of Importance	Responses	Frequency Mentioned
1.	More practical projects, such as the Lenawee County Project, with more time allowed	7
2.	More time for research	6
3.	More time given to business education	5
5.5	An air-conditioned classroom	3
5.5	Group research projects (rather than individual papers)	3
5.5	More field trips	3
5.5	Develop an area program as a group project	3
11.	More appropriate physical facilities	2
11.	More information concerning distributive education	2
11.	More group problems	2
11.	More information relating to vocational education legislation	2
11.	More consultants in agriculture	2
11.	More opportunities for class discussion	2
11.	More of Dr. Odiorne	2
15.	Twenty other items each mentioned once	1

Table IV(a) indicates some of the responses to Question 4: "What suggestions would you make for future workshops in terms of course content?"

TABLE IV(b)

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE—DELETIONS

Rank Order of Importance	Responses	Frequency Mentioned
1.5	Individual research papers	4
1.5	Driver education information	4
3.	Some of the more theoretical speakers	3
4.	Omit some speakers, thus leaving more time to discuss speaker presentation	2
5.	Eleven other items each mentioned once	1

Table IV(b) indicates some of the responses to Question 4: "What suggestions would you make for future workshops in terms of course content?"

TABLE V(a)

SUGGESTIONS FOR LENGTH OF WORKSHOP—WEEKS

Number of Weeks	Frequency	Percent
4	1	5
6	8	40
8	11	55
10	0	0
Totals	20	100

Table V(a) records the responses to Question 5(a): "What would you suggest as the most appropriate length of time for the workshop in terms of weeks?"

TABLE V(b)

SUGGESTIONS FOR LENGTH OF WORKSHOP—HOURS PER DAY

Hours per Day	Frequency	Percent
4	9	45
5	4	20
6	7	35
7	0	0
Totals	20	100

Table V(b) gives the responses to Question 5(b): "What would you suggest as the most appropriate length of time for the workshop in terms of hours per day?"

APPENDIX H

RANK OF INTERNSHIP FIELD VISITATIONS BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITS MADE BY THE 40 PARTICIPANTS IN THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
(Winter Term - 1965)

Rank	Type of Field Visitation	Total Number of Visits
1	Industrial Arts	69
2	High School Community	52
3	Day Trade, Vocational Industrial	50
4	Cooperative T. and I. (Trade and Industrial)	42
5	Cooperative Distributive	38
6.5	Cooperative Office Practice	36
6.5	Post Secondary Vocational-Technical	36
8	Home Economics	35
9.5	Manpower Development and Training (MDTA)	27
9.5	Vocational Director's Workshop	27
11	Apprentice Training	23
12	P.T.A. Meetings	22
13	Chamber of Commerce, Service Clubs, etc.	20
14	Faculty and Board of Education Meetings	18
15	Adult Extension T. and I.	16
17	Vocational Agriculture	12
17	Michigan Employment Security Commission	12
17	Economic Opportunity Act Programs	12
19	Trade-Technical Conference	11
20	Guidance	10
21	Advisory Committee Meetings	8
22	Industries and Businesses	7
23.5	Development Groups	6
23.5	Nurses Training	6
24	Labor Unions	3
		TOTAL 598